MR. CHAIRMAN: So far as the Ministry of Finance is concerned, it is only concerned with the financing part of it. As regards the question whether a particular thing is up-to-date or is the latest or not, that is for the Ministry concerned to decide. It is not the job of the Finance Ministry. The Finance Minister is not supposed to be a jack of all trades.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: What is all this? It is a wasteful discussion.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I take strong objection to his remark. Mr. Kulkarni is saying that it is a wasteful discussion. Does it mean that only what Mr. Kulkarni says is a useful discussion and whatever anybody else says is wasteful?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You decide it outside. My suggestion is both of you decide on it in the Central Hall.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It does not behove a learned man like the Professor...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I said both of you decide on it outside over a cup of coffee or whatever. Now I have called Mr. Bir Bhadra Pratap Singh.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: I must congratulate the honourable Minister of Finance for his clever reply....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Congratulation is not part of the Question Hour.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Is it a right-handed compliment or left-handed compliment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question Hour is neither for right-handed compliment nor for left-handed compliment.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: The Minister started with "there is no such subsisting agreement". It means a future agreement could be there. It is quite open out of this answer. The second reply was, "Soft loans are converted into grants. Therefore, the question that was put by Mr. Morarka does not arise." My humble question is, I am eager to know, whether we have adopted an opendoor policy about these foreign loans once again including Canada.

SHRI B. K. GADHVI: There is absolutely no question of an opening. It was a loan agreement before 1986. Later on it was converted into grants. Therefore, there is no subsisting agreeement on this.

**Clearance of proposals for Noida Export processing zones**

*144. SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state:

(a) how many proposals in the Noida Export Processing Zones have been cleared so far in the stipulated time of 45—60 days; and

(b) how many proposals are under Government's consideration that have crossed 60 days and what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI): (a) 102 proposals have been cleared within a period of 45—60 days in the Noida Export Processing Zone.

(b) Six proposals are pending decision. These cases require further scrutiny in the light of additional information or clarifications that have been called for and are awaited.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: My question is: Which are the six proposals that are pending decision? Because, they clear almost all between 45 and 60 days. Now it is well known that one of the proposals is regarding Coca Cola. It has been reported in the *Business Standard* of February 5, more than 2-1/2 months back, that the Commerce Minister said that the Coca-Cola proposal to set up a unit in one of the export processing zones runs

contrary to the concept and the philosophy behind the creation of such units. It is already two and a half months that he has already publicly declared that it is running contrary. And if this is one of the proposals that is pending, he should have said that this is one of the important proposals. Why has it not been rejected by this time so that the pending work could have been lessened this much? And what is the philosophy behind the export processing zones and how are they functioning because this is very important. He said that these cases require further scrutiny. Therefore, I talked about Coca-Cola. He said, 'in the light of additional information or clarification'. So, what are those important units from whom they are asking additional clarifications and additional information? Because it is gigantic companies like the Coca-Cola, they are saying this. Otherwise they would have rejected and they have rejected so many companies in the past. This is a 100 per cent foreign-owned unit. They want to sell 25 per cent of their goods in the Indian market. That is also declared. Why are they so much hesitant, why are they so much vacillating? Kindly reply to this question.

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Sir, if I may kindly draw your attention, part (b) of the question is not mentioned specifically for Coca-Cola only. It said: How many proposals are not cleared? That is the precise question. And the reply is that six are awaiting decision. The names of the six units are: Ganapati Exports Limited; then S.C. Bhargava, and Amit Mittal for manufacturing silicon vapours; then J.K. Synthetics; then Coca-Cola Corporation for manufacture of compound for using concentrates; and then Mohammed F.A. for manufacturing disposable surgical equipment, etc. It is not only Coca-Cola but six proposals are awaiting for further scrutiny and details. In so far as Coca-Cola is concerned, it is a fact that there is no compulsion and there is no statutory obligation that wihin 60 days each one has to be cleared. But, on case to case basis, we may have to seek clarifications from the Inter-Ministerial meetings and Departments. We may have to look into the prospect and the aspect of the domestic areas in fact. And unless all these details are scrutinised properly, there is no point of taking any hurried decision as such, in regard to Coca-Cola also.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: But, Sir, the hon. Minister of Commerce himself said two and a half months back that this is running counter to the philosophy behind the EP Zones. Now, why do you entertain such proposals? What are the merits to be considered? Are you going to consider what is against our national interest? Does that also require consideration for two and a half months? Why could you not reject it immediately? This is my point. Are you changing your form, are you changing your policy—what are you doing?—and therefore you can entertain such a proposal inimical to our national industry?

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Sir, I think, the hon. Member is referring to some newspaper report. Officially, from the Ministry of Commerce, neither myself nor my senior colleague have said at any point of time that this is contrary to the philosophy of EP Zone, and I would like to make it clear...

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Here is the 'Business Standard'...

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Many people carry newspaper reports and most of them are found to be not correct. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to inform the hon. Member through you in the House that any proposal which comes, we do scrutinise and examine, as I have stated earlier, all the aspects, not only the aspects in the matter of export but also the national economic interest, the effect on the domestic economy as well as our future trade prospect in terms of the export earnable. All these matters require time, require clarifications, and unless we ae sufficiently satisfied there is no point of telling that we have cleared or rejected. That is the position which the Ministry of Commerce or the Department should always adopt because

trade is a matter which should not be rigidly explained. It is a matter to be examined in all its aspects. Therefore, we have taken time, and information and clarifications are still being awaited.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Sir, he has not answered it. I am asking the same question. What clarifications are you asking for? He said, he has asked for clarifications. In the question itself he said that this requires further scrutiny. Therefore, I am putting a supplementary as to what further scrutiny are you asking for. And he said, 'well, I am asking for scrutiny.'

Secondly, here is the Business Standard report and Mr. Dinesh Singh's speech is there. It says that this Coca-Cola concept putting the industry in the export processing zone is counter to our philosophy. Now, what they are considering, I would like to know. Whether they can accommodate that, that is the question that I have been asking.

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Sir, the Coca-Cola unit and that party came to India and they themselves tried to submit many proposals along with this to justify their viewpoints and they themselves agreed to give some more information in regard to the further prospect along with their proposal within the EPZ unit. These are clarifications which we sought from them and they are giving the clarifications in many areas, including the domestic area of what will be the ultimate impact if we follow rigidly the norm. If not, what are the other things they can do? They themselves came forward and submitted some proposals on their own. These are the matters of detailed clarifications and these they are giving to us.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Sir, he has not replied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Shri P. K. Kunjachen. (*Interruptions*) I cannot force him to say anything more. It is for him to decide. (*Interruptions*). Please sit down Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: But he cannot also answer like this.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: Sir, is it not a fact that a proposal for setting up the Coca-Cola factory has been objected to by the Ministries of Finance, Industry and Food Processing? Is it not a fact that the proposal is going to affect the indigenous manufacturers of soft drinks? Is it not a fact that it is only low technology import? Considering the above facts, will the Government be prepared to abandon the scheme forthwith?

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Sir, as I have stated earlier, the Board of Approval represents various Ministries, including the administrative Ministry of a particular item which is called for in a particular application and the Department and the various Ministries do give their views, amend their views, making the total assessment and observation after obtaining certain clarifications. It is difficult for me at this stage to inform the hon. Member and the hon. House as to which particular department, which Ministry at what stage stated what at he board of approval meeting. It is not possible on our part. What we do. Sir, is that we collectively sit in the board of approval meeting, and more so recently a special board of approval meeting was held headed by the Commerce Secretary himself where the highest investment ratio proposals and programmes or matters concerning the various sensitive count various Ministries' viewpoints. Each Ministry's viewpoint in every matter concerning the minutes cannot be disclosed at this stage, I am sorry, Sir.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: What are the compelling reasons which have prompted the Government to set up this proposal? What are the reasons, the compelling reasons?

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: The compelling reason, you wait for further clarifications, is (a) to take care of our own national interest and the national economy, (b) to take care of the effect on the domestic market, and (c) to see the long-term effect in export turnover in terms of actual earnings of foreign exchange.. (*Interruptions*)..These are the things.

SHRI P. K. KUNJACHEN: What are the advantages for the Government of India and the people of India?

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Sir, I want to know whether the Minister is satisfied with the performance of the units which are already functioning, how many were actually permitted to be set up and how many have actually started functioning and whether they are following the philosophy outlined for them, whether they are following high-technology and what were their exports last year and this year.

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: So far as this question is concerned, it is about NOIDA. Because the question relates to NOIDA, I cannot give information about all the other areas, because the question is specially related to NOIDA. The position is like this that in the year 1988-89 the target was about Rs. 30 crores, and we have completed Rs. 21.34 crores. In fact, we claim that it is a good performance in the sense that NOIDA has very recently picked up a few other new export units. In so far as the total export of all the units is concerned, in general I can only say that in 1988-89, the target fixed was Rs. 428.5 crores, whereas our achievement is Rs. 516.52 crores. In so far as other proposals that are coming are concerned, yes, a few hi-tech proposals are awaited, but so far, the units functioning now in the EPZ are not very hi-tech areas. We do hope that in the near future, especially in the new zones, few more units will be interested to be set up there because of our new export policy and the economic policy of the country.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: I am surprised because, as I am quoting Mr. Dinesh Singh. He has said that he was disappointed with the functioning of the EPZ and he said that export performance is very bad and high technology was not being followed. How is there this contradiction between the statement of his senior Minister and his statement?

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: We always say that EPZ units are functioning better than other and we always give this emphasis. It is natural. There is no contradiction and so far as NOIDA is concerned, I have given performance figures.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : माननीय मंत्री जी बतायें कि जब इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्ट्री, फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री और फूड प्रोसैसिंग मिनिस्ट्री तीनों ने इस प्रोपोजल को नामंजूर कर दिया है, स्पेशल बोर्ड आफ अप्रूवल ने भी इसको अस्वीकार कर दिया है और इस वजह से अस्वीकार किया है कि भारत की जो इंडिजनस इंडस्ट्री है उस पर इसका प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ेगा फिर किस कारण इस हंड्रेड परसेंट फोरेन ओन्ड केपिटल को देश में स्थापित करने पर सरकार विचार कर रही है? मेरा दूसरा पार्ट यह है कि अगर विचार कर रही है तो क्या इस फोरेन ओन्ड केपिटल में 51 परसेंट या इससे अधिक शेयर भारत सरकार के होंगे? जो इनकी विदेशी मुद्रा अर्जित होगी उस विदेशी मुद्रा में भी इसी प्रोपोर्शन से भारत को हमारा शेयर मिलेगा? मन्त्रवर विदेश के अंदर इंडिजनस इंडस्ट्री पर इसका प्रतिकूल प्रभाव न पड़े इसके लिए इन्हें बाहर विदेश में ही भेजा जायेगा क्या यह सरकार के विचाराधीन है?

श्री पी०आर० दास मुंशी : सभापति महोदय, मुझे बहुत अफसोस है कि आदरणीय सदस्य को ज्यादा ही जानकारी मेरे दफ्तर से है। क्योंकि ऐसी कोई सूचना मेरे पास नहीं है कि फलाना दफ्तर, कलाना मिनिस्ट्री उसको पूरा इन्कार करती है और हम लोग बेवकूफ होकर बैठे हैं। हम लोग सब को साथ लेकर बातचीत कर रहे हैं। उनसे जो कुछ सूचना प्राप्त होनी चाहिए उसके लिए हम इंतजार कर रहे हैं।

मैं आपको यह समझाना चाहूंगा, बताना चाहूंगा कि हमारा दफ्तर वाणिज्य दफ्तर है। इसमें मुक्त वाणिज्य अंचल में कोई ऐसी नीति नहीं होनी चाहिए जिससे दुनिया में इस देश की ऐसी छाप पड़े कि हिन्दुस्तान में आदमी का मुक्त वाणिज्य के दफ्तर में घुसना मुश्किल है। अगर ऐसा हम वातावरण पैदा करें तो देश के लिए मुश्किल होगा क्योंकि मुक्त वाणिज्य के नियम कुछ अलग होते हैं। जितना कुछ सामान लाया जाता है उसको पूरा ही बाहर भेजना होता है वेल्यु एडीशन के द्वारा इसलिए ऐसा वातावरण हमें नहीं फैलाना है। जहां तक कोका कोला का सवाल है मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं...

श्री बीरेन्द्र वर्मा : यह कोका कोला पर ही सारा हो रहा है।

श्री पी आर० दास मुंशी : मैं इतनी ही सूचना देना चाहूंगा कि जहाँ तक कोका कोला का सवाल है उनका इन्वेस्टमेंट प्रोपोजल तीन करोड़ से अधिक है। उनसे जो फोरेन एक्सचेंज की आमदनी होगी 28 करोड़ की होगी उनमें से 25 करोड़ पांच साल के प्रोजेक्शन में एक्सपोर्ट अर्निंग के द्वारा है और उसका नैट प्रोफिट 18 करोड़ बताया गया है। 18 करोड़ से रिपैटरिएट करना देश से लाने के लिए उनका अधिकार 5 करोड़ के करीब रहेगा और देश के अंदर रहने का हम को अधिकार 13 करोड़ का रहेगा। यह प्रोजेक्शन का फिगर है जो हमारे विचाराधीन है।

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: I understand that this particular export processing zone has got single window clearance. But in this particular Coca-Cola case, why should we go to Cabinet level to take a decision?

When you have got a single-window clearance method, why did it go up to the Cabinet Committee? This is a multinational corporation. You have already allowed Pepsi Cola to come in. You have allowed them to set up their unit here. Why are you allowing another multinational company to come in? Why are you allowing them when we have indigenous units engaged in this field, soft-drink concentrate production? What are you waiting for? What information do you want from this company?

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Sir, first of all, I would like to point out that it has not gone to the Cabinet level. It is not correct. This is still being discussed and considered by the Special Board of Approval comprising of...

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: The Board of Approval has already objected to the proposal.

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV: How do you know? He is the Minister. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: I would like to inform the hon. Member that this is still being considered by the Special Board of Approval. They have asked for some clarifications. It has not gone to the Cabinet Committee. The Special Board of Approval has met many times. They are still seeking some clarifications.

Secondly, in regard to EPZs., the hon. Member may be aware that even in China and in other prominent socialist countries . . .

SHRI N. E. BALARAM: Do not speak about China. Speak about India.

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: The hon. Member must appreciate the concept of EPZs (*Interruptions*)

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: The question was only about the NOIDA EPZ, in India. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Sir, the EPZs have no objection to multi-nationals

coming in provided they help in maintaining value addition and bring foreign exchange to the country within the national economic interests. This kind of campaign does not help promote the concept of EPZs in the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 145. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, kindly allow me I will just take half-a-minute. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dipen Ghosh, you are a leader. I have given change to Mr. Kunjachen.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I have a supplementary which the other hon. Members have not raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case, you should have told Mr. Kunjachen. Question No. 145.

**High rise buildings without fire-fighting devices**

*145. SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY:
SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHAKRISHNA†:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a news-item which appeared in the Indian Express of the 14th April, 1989 under the caption '169 sky scrapers lack fire-fighting devices';

(b) if so, what are the details of the ownership of each of these high-rise buildings in Delhi which lack fire-fighting devices;

(c) whether Government have taken any action against the owners of all these buildings for not installing the fire-fighting equipment; and

(d) what are the reasons for which the NDMC/MCD had given completion certificates of each of these buildings without insisting for the prior installation of fire-fighting devices in those building ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV): (a) to (d) A statement (*See* below) alongwith an Annexure, is laid on the Table of the House.

[*See* Appendix CL, Annexure No. 47]

**Statement**

*High-rise buildings without fire fighting devices*

Government have seen the news item.

2. Prior to 1983, there was no provision for enforcing fire safety measures. Consequenst upon devastating fires in high-rise buildings, the need for effective enforcement of fire safety measures was felt. Accordingly, Delhi Fire Prevention and Fire Safety Act, 1986 was enacted and came into force on 2nd March, 1987. The Rules framed thereunder were notified on 31st March, 1987.

3. In respect of buildings constructed after the notification of Unified Buildings Bye-Laws in 1983, grant of occupancy certificate was made subject to the provision of fire-safety measures as prescribed by the Chief Fire-Officer.

4. In respect of high-rise buildings constructed prior to 1983 (when there was no statutory requirement for providing fire safety measures), inspections were conducted by the Delhi Fire Service and notices were issued (details of ownership are annexed) for provision of essential fire safety measures as prescribed under the Delhi Fire Prevention and Fire Safety Act, 1986. According to a recent survey by Delhi Fire Service, appreciable progress has been achieved in this direction.

**श्री पुट्टापागा राधाकृष्ण** : सभापति जी, बूटा सिंह जी का एक स्टेटमेंट है। मैं उसको झूठा नहीं कहता हूं, लेकिन एक बात है . . .

**एक माननीय सदस्य** : क्यों नहीं कहते ?

*The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Puttapaga Radhakrishna.